arXiv:1403.0759v2 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 5 Mar 2015

Efimov states in Li-Cs mixtures within a minimal model

N. T. Zinner
Department of Physics and Astronomy - Aarhus University, Ny Munkegade, bygn. 1520, DK-8000 Århus C, Denmark

N. G. Nygaard
Lundbeck Foundation Theoretical Center for Quantum System Research, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Aarhus University, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

We use a minimal zero-range model for describing the bound state spectrum of three-body states consisting of two Cesium and one Lithium atom. Using a broad Feshbach resonance model for the two-body interactions, we show that recent experimental data can be described surprisingly well for particular values of the three-body parameter that governs the short-range behavior of the atomic potentials and is outside the scope of the zero-range model. Studying the spectrum as a function of the three-body parameter suggests that the lowest state seen in experiment could be influenced by finite range corrections. We also consider the question of Fermi degeneracy and corresponding Pauli blocking of the Lithium atoms on the Efimov states.

Introduction. The ability to study few-body states in the low-energy regime with cold atoms has allowed the observation of Efimov three-body states [1, 2] and also resonances associated with bound states of four or more particles [3–22]. The key property of these low-energy bound states is a discrete scaling symmetry [23, 24] that has been difficult to observe in experiments (a very recent paper presents evidence for the observation of a second Efimov resonance in Cesium [25]). Theory shows that systems with a large mass imbalance between the bound state constituents are highly suited for studying the discrete scaling since the scaling factor becomes small and more states should be observable within experimental constraints.

This search has prompted different groups to pursue cold atomic experiments with mixtures of different atoms. In particular, recent experiments by the Weidemüller group in Heidelberg [26] and the Chin group in Chicago [27] have pursued mixtures of ^{6}Li and ^{133}Cs which has a suitably low scaling factor of around 4.8 (depending on the number of resonant two-body subsystems [23]). The first experimental results have now been presented by both the Chicago group [28] and most recently by the Heidelberg group [29]. Here we will focus mostly on the data presented in Ref. [28] and make a comparison at the end. In Ref. [28] they find three consective Efimov peaks that are attributed to the Cs-Cs-Li system when working with a Feshbach resonance located at a magnetic field of 842.75 Gauss (G). Since the Cs-Cs scattering length at these fields is negative there are no molecular thresholds to worry about and thus the system is ideal for studying the formation of Efimov trimers from the three-atom continuum. The observations are done by analyzing atom loss peaks associated with the threshold. In this short paper, we consider a minimal model for describing the experimental data that uses zero-range interactions and the simplest model for describing the two-body Feshbach resonances. Our results are in good agreement with the experiments although we do see some differences for the most bound trimer that may be associated with finite range corrections. This system could be useful for studying the effects of a many-body background on the few-body physics [30]. We therefore consider the influence of the Fermi degeneracy in the Lithium component on the Efimov states by introducing a Pauli blocking in the light constituent. For Lithium densities in the range 10^6 to 10^{12} cm^{-3} we find virtually no changes in the three-body thresholds for Efimov trimer formation.

Model. To solve the Schrödinger equation for the three-body problem with short-range interactions, we use a zero-range momentum-space method similar to the one introduced by Skorniakov and Ter-Martirosian [31] but suitably regularized by the method of Danilov [32] (see the discussion in [33]). This regularization method has typically been applied to equal mass systems but it is straighforward to generalize to our case with different masses (see the appendix of Ref. [34]). In the regularization we assume that all three two-body subsystems are resonantly interacting in order to obtain the Efimov scale factor. While this is not the case for the experimental Cs-Cs-Li system, the Cs-Cs interaction is nevertheless very large and we expect the difference to be small (in any case the difference in the Efimov scale factor is small, see Fig. 1 in Ref. [35]).

The zero-range interactions are parameterized by the two-body scattering lengths and in the general case of non-identical masses and scattering lengths this yields a set of coupled integral equations that can be solved by discretization (see the appendix of Ref. [34] for details on the formalism). It is important to note that we take the scattering length of all subsystems and particularly its magnetic field dependence (see below) into account in our model, both that of the two heavy-light and the heavy-heavy systems. A necessity of a zero-range model is a three-body parameter, κ, that is used in the regularization of the equations. It can be physically interpreted

as a short-range repulsive force that is due to the hard-core nature of the inter-atomic potentials at short distance. Here we assume that κ is a constant and will not depend on any external magnetic fields. We will work at zero temperature and without any explicit decay channels in the model. The latter implies that we are making the assumption that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the threshold at which an Efimov state appears out of the three-atom continuum and the loss peak in the measurement. This is a simplied picture yet it is our express goal to explore the capabilities of a minimal model for describing the data.

To model the two-body interactions that are tuned by Feshbach resonances in experiments, we note that the resonances in the Cs-Cs-Li case are all entrance channel dominated and of large resonance strength (also called broad resonances in many places). Therefore we use the simplest model where the scattering length has the parameterization [36]

$$a(B) = a_{bg}\left(1 + \frac{\Delta}{B - B_0}\right). \qquad (1)$$

Here a_{bg} is the background scattering length away from the resonance, Δ is the resonance width, and B_0 is the position. The Cs-Cs system has a very wide resonance around 787 G [37]. The Efimov states occur for fields around 840-850 G and in this regime the Cs-Cs systems has a large negative scattering length. We will therefore keep the parameters of this heavy-heavy subsystem fixed in our model with $B_0 = 787$ G, $\Delta = 87.5$ G, and $a_{bg} = -1940a_0$, where a_0 is the Bohr radius. We have checked that changes in Δ and a_{bg} for the Cs-Cs channel within the ranges that are given in the literature [36–39] have no noticable effect on the results discussed here. This is connected to the fact that this resonance is very broad. On the other hand, for the Li-Cs subsystems we work with two parameter sets below to reflect the different values given in recent papers [26, 27].

Results. We first consider the Li-Cs Feshbach resonance data given in Ref. [27] (and updated in Ref. [28]). The reported best fit value for the position is $B_0 = 842.75$ G, while the backgtround scattering length is $a_{bg} = -22a_0$. We use $\Delta = 62$ G from Ref. [27]. This specifies everything in our model except for the three-body parameter, κ, which we can then vary. In Fig. 1 we show the calculated magnetic field positions as a function of κ along with the experimental data. The thick solid lines denote the position at which the three-body Efimov trimer hits the three-atom continuum. Each line terminates at a given value of κ as the spectrum is pushed upwards by decreasing κ and thus less trimers are present. To avoid confusion we stress that these theoretical lines have been obtained by taking a fixed value of κ, then computing the spectrum at the three-atom continuum threshold, then changing to a new value of κ and repeating this. These threshold spectra may then be connected into three solid lines as given in the figure. It is very important to notice that there is *no* magnetic field dependence of κ in any of the calculations presented here, κ is always a constant input parameter.



FIG. 1: Magnetic field positions at which Efimov trimers cross the three-atom continuum as function of the three-body parameter, κ. The solid lines are the three resonances (they disappear for small but different κ values). The vertical dashed lines are the experimental values reported in Ref. [28]. The three horizontal dotted lines mark the positions at which the vertical dashed experimental results and solid theoretical calculation results cross (see the text). The vertical solid line shows the position of the Li-Cs Feshbach resonance.

The three dotted lines in Fig. 1 mark the points at which the vertical dashed experimental lines and the solid theoretical calculations overlap, i.e. it gives the value of κ for which the minimal model reproduces exactly one of the experimental data points. Ideally, these three dotted lines would coincide implying that a single constant value of the three-body parameter κ could reproduce the data in the minimal model. This is, however, not the case. We may turn the argument around and say that in a minimal model one needs to fix κ to an experimental data point in order for all parameters to be determined. This could be done for either of the three experimental points, but would of course imply that the predictions of the model would be slightly off for the other two points. However, the values of the dotted lines lie in the range from $\kappa = 0.0095a_0^{-1}$ to $\kappa = 0.013a_0^{-1}$ so the variation is only around 25% which we consider very good for this minimal model.

We typically associate κ with short-range physics that does not change from state to state. On the other hand, the deeper Efimov states are more susceptible to finite-range corrections [40]. This can cause the discrepancy and the difference in where the experimental results and theoretical calculations overlap for the three loss features. The difference in κ between the two states at the smaller magnetic fields (closer to the Feshbach resonance) is seen

to be smaller as expected. A possible solution to this problem is to postulate a variation in κ with magnetic field to describe experimental data. This has been noted also for equal mass Efimov studies in three-component ^{6}Li systems and interpreted as an energy-dependence of κ [13]. Finite-range corrections can be one cause of such an effect. In a model where one also includes the effective range, r_e, the threshold for the most bound Efimov trimer will move depending on the sign of r_e [40]. The trimer line on the far right in Fig. 1 would move to smaller magnetic field values for $r_e > 0$ according to the results of Ref. [40]. However, other models have found different behaviour [41] and a more precise model such as a multi-channel framework [42] seems necessary to explore this issue. We stress again that we have used a constant κ in all the calculations reported here.

We may provide a slightly more quantitative estimate of the finite-range corrections by using the results of Ref. [40]. This can be done by considering the relation between the scattering length at which an Efimov state emerges out of the three-atom continuum, a^n_-, and the energy on resonance of the same state, E^n_∞. One typically defines a momentum scale, κ^n, through $E^n_\infty = -\frac{\hbar^2(\kappa^n)^2}{2m_r}$, where m_r is the reduced mass. In Ref. [40] the product of $\kappa^0 a^0_-$ for the ground state of equal mass systems was explored when including the effective range using different scattering models (see Fig. 5 of Ref. [40]). To get a simple estimate we now make some assumptions to relate our mass imbalanced case to the equal mass results.

We will assume that the Li-Cs scattering length is the important interaction and use the Feshbach resonance values given above to convert between the magnetic field values and a_-. Second, we will with the three-body parameter $\kappa = 0.01175 a_0^{-1}$, a value for which the two excited Efimov states we calculate fit well with experimental magnetic field values according to Fig. 1. Now we will use the second excited Efimov state as our reference point as it should be least sensitive to numerical details (this is one reason for the near insensitivity to κ of this second excited state seen in Fig. 1). We may then compute κ^2 by numerically determining the energy of the second excited state on resonance at $B = 842.75$ G. We find a theoretical value of $\kappa^2 a^2_- = -29.17$ (using simple units where $m_r = m_{\rm Li}$). In a pure zero-range approach, we should then be able to get κ^0 from κ^2 by use of the scale factor, i.e. $\kappa^0 = e^{2\pi/s_0}\kappa^2$, where $e^{\pi/s_0} \sim 4.8$ is the Efimov scaling factor for the Li-Cs system. If we now use the experimental value of $a^0_- \sim -265.14 a_0$ with this calculated value of κ^0 we find $\kappa^0 a^0_- = -25.69$, which is about 12% lower than for the second excited state. From the equal mass case in Ref. [40] a lower values implies a negative value of r_e/a_{bg}, which is consistent with $r_e > 0$ since $a_{bg} < 0$ here. For an equal mass system a 12% decrease corresponds to r_e/a_{bg} between -1 and -3 roughly (see Fig. 5 in Ref. [40]). If $\kappa^0 a^0_-$ depends only weakly on the mass ratio in the system then we can estimate that a finite-range correction in the range $r_e \sim 22 - 66 a_0$ is necessary to explain the deviation of the ground state Efimov state from the zero-range model. Interestingly, the van der Waals length of Li-Cs is in this range $r_{\rm vdW} = 45 a_0$ [29]. This could still be a coincidence as r_e and $r_{\rm vdW}$ are generally different [36]. At this point we could not locate a theoretical value for r_e in this system for comparison. If there is a stronger dependence of finite-range corrections on the mass ratio then this will change the numbers found here. Taking these corrections into account in the momentum-space formalism we have used in this work is not straightforward and is left for future studies.

Overall, we would describe the agreement as very good given the simplicity of the model. Moreover, it is interesting to note that our zero temperature model so closely reproduces the data for the two states closest to the Feshbach resonance. Also, the experiment finds very little change with temperature of the Efimov resonance closest to resonance which should be the most sensitive one. A zero temperature formalism seems therefore to work well.

We have also studied a second set of parameters that are taken from Ref. [26]. The resonance position is slightly changed to $B_0 = 843.5$ G, while $\Delta = 60.4$ G and $a_{bg} = -28.5 a_0$. We do this to test the overall features and their robustness while still keeping close contact with experimentally realistic numbers. However, since the qualitative picture is identical to Fig. 1 we omit a figure. The only change is quantitative as the Efimov features move with the Feshbach resonance position. This implies that the scenario seen in both experiments is quite robust and does not depend much on the specifics of the two-body resonances. We conclude that the Cs-Cs-Li system is extremely well-suited for the study of few-body physics. In comparison to the most recent data from the Heidelberg group [29], we note that the position of the Feshbach resonance reported there is now consistent with the Chicago value [28]. There is some discrepancy in the value of the magnetic field of the first Efimov loss peak with a best fit value that is larger than in Ref. [28]. The two other features reported in the data have best fit values that are very close in both experiments. However, while the Heidelberg group also find evidence of a third peak close to the Feshbach resonance, they cannot conclude that it displays the universal Efimov scaling behaviour.

Recent data [14] and a number of theoretical works [41, 43–49] have suggested a new type of universality in the Efimov three-body problem where the three-body parameter, κ, is related to the two-body van der Waals length of the inter-atomic potential in a simple manner. In Fig. 1, we see that a value of around $\kappa \sim 0.01 a_0^{-1}$ is needed to reproduce the experimental data in our minimal model. Translating this momentum scale into length yields $L = \kappa^{-1} = 100 a_0$ which is almost exactly equal to the van der Waals length of the Cs-Cs system ($101 a_0$). This can be understood from a Born-Oppenheimer point

of view where the light Li atom creates an effective potential for the two heavy Cs-Cs atoms where in the bound states can be calculated. The natural cut-off on the universal part in this picture is the short-range Cs-Cs van der Waals length. Here we have used a momentum space approach so a more precise translation from κ to length scale is necessary to put this on a more firm footing.



FIG. 2: Magnetic field positions of the Efimov trimers for $\kappa = 0.01a_0^{-1}$ as function of the density of fermionic ^{6}Li atoms, n. The horizontal axis is logarithmic and expends over six decades.

Finally, we consider the question of whether the system could be suitable for investigating the effects of quantum degeneracy on the three-body physics. More specifically, we ask whether a finite density of fermionic ^{6}Li atoms can influence the loss peaks. We still assume zero temperature as above. The effects of a Fermi sea on bound state complexes have been the subject of a lot of recent work [34, 50–54].

We will now briefly explain our approach to including a Fermi sea (full details can be found in the appendix of Ref. [34]). Here we consider the simplest approximation where the Fermi sea is considered inert, and thus its effect is Pauli blocking of states for the Lithium atom constituent in the trimer. The momentum-space three-body equations can be derived by considering the scattering of a single atom on a dimer (see Ref. [24] for an extensive elaboration on how this is done). The bound state equations for three different atoms will generally yields a set of three coupled integral equations [34], where the ingredients are the Green's function (propagator) for a single atom and the progator for a pair of atoms, the dimer propagator. To include a background Fermi sea in one of the components, one must do two things. First, in the propagator for the atom with the Fermi sea one introduces a Pauli blokcing factor, i.e. $\theta(k_F - k)$ where $\theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function and k_F is the Fermi momentum which is given by the density of the fermionic atom. This means that only states with momenta above the Fermi sea are allowed. Likewise, when the atom with the Fermi sea is in a dimer one needs to modify the dimer propagator by taking Pauli blocking of one of its constituents into account. This requires some calculation, details can be found in Ref. [34]. One these two effects are takne into account, one may now solve the coupled integral equations for a given k_F to obtain the bound states and the spectral flow as a function of k_F. In this simple approach we do not consider particle-hole pairs in the Fermi sea. Such corrections are expected bring some quantitative changes to thresholds but not to the overall physical picture of a spectral flow. Within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, this was discussed in Ref. [51] (see also the appendix to Ref. [34] for a discussion).

We again make the assumption that the loss peak can be mapped to the three-atom continuum threshold position which will generally shift due to the Fermi sea [34]. In Fig. 2 we show the calculated loss peak positions as a function of the density of ^{6}Li atoms. The three-body parameter was taken to be $\kappa = 0.01a_0^{-1}$. We have checked that the results in Fig. 2 are not sensitive to κ as long as it is chosen in the range where three states are found as in Fig. 1 ($\kappa > 0.0095a_0^{-1}$). The density in Fig. 2 extends over six decades from 10^6 cm^{-3} to 10^{12} cm^{-3} which is an experimentally relevant range. In spite of this large variation in density we find basically no effect on the thresholds. There is a small upturn on the third Efimov resonance closest to the Feshbach resonance for the largest densities. However, given the uncertainties in the numerical procedure we cannot conclude that this is a physical effect. These data suggest that studying the effect of Fermi degeneracy on Efimov physics could be difficult for this system. This fact is presumably connected to the fact that the mass imbalance in the system is very large. It is known [23, 24] that the effective three-body hyperradial equation has an attractive inverse sqaure potential whose strength will increase with increasing mass imbalance and thus make the resulting three-body states more bound. In turn, it requires a larger Fermi energy to perturb the states and thus we need much higher density of fermionic atoms to see a spectral flow.

Conclusions. Using a minimal zero-range three-body bound state calculation we have managed to reproduce experimental data on Efimov states in highly mass imbalanced systems quite well. The difference between the experimental data and the model was largest for the deepest bound Efimov state seen in experiment, yet it was still in fairly good agreement with the calculations. The lowest state is expected to have the largest finite-range corrections in a given spectrum and we speculate that this could be the cause. This is outside the scope of our minimal model. We also estimate the effect of the fermionic nature of the Lithium atoms by introducing a Pauli blocking effect. However, in a large range of exper-

imentally relevant densities we find virtually no influence on the Efimov thresholds.

The current study does not take the decay of Efimov states into account. This can be done in different ways [24, 55, 56], but requires an input parameter to describe the decay which goes into deep bound two-body states as there are no Feshbach molecules on this side of the Feshbach resonance. Temperature is another effect that should be taken into account, particularly on the width of the Efimov resonances as discussed in Ref. [28]. Furthermore, the potential effects of a condensate in the heavy Cesium component would be interesting to study. While the fermionic nature of the light component did not look important based on the current results, a condensate could still have an interesting effect. For instance, the linear dispersion relation of (interacting) condensed bosons can cause changes in three-body dissociation thresholds as the condensate coherence length changes. This can be shown most clearly using the Born-Oppenheimer approximation for the case where the light particle is condensed [57]. For the current system it is the heavy component that could form a condensate and a different approach is needed.

[1] Efimov V 1970 *Yad. Fiz* **12** 1080; 1971 *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **12** 589
[2] Kraemer T *et al* 2006 *Nature* **440** 315
[3] T. B. Ottenstein, T. Lompe, M. Kohnen, A. N. Wenz, and S. Jochim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 203202 (2008).
[4] Pollack S E, Dries D and Hulet R G 2009 *Science* **326** 1683
[5] Zaccanti M *et al* 2009 *Nature Phys.* **5** 586
[6] Gross N, Shotan Z, Kokkelmans S and Khaykovich L 2009 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** 163202
[7] Huckans J H, Williams J R, Hazlett E L, Stites R W and O'Hara K M 2009 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** 165302
[8] Williams J R, Hazlett E L, Huckans J H, Stites R W, Zhang Y and O'Hara K M 2009 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** 130404
[9] Gross N, Shotan Z, Kokkelmans S and Khaykovich L 2010 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 103203
[10] Lompe T, Ottenstein T B, Serwane F, Wenz A N, Zürn G and Jochim S 2010 *Science* **330** 940
[11] Lompe T, Ottenstein T B, Serwane F, Viering K, Wenz A N, Zürn G and Jochim S 2010 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 103201
[12] Nakajima S, Horikoshi M, Mukaiyama T, Naidon P and Ueda M 2010 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 023201
[13] Nakajima S, Horikoshi M, Mukaiyama T, Naidon P and Ueda M 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** 143201
[14] Berninger M *et al* 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** 120401
[15] Wild R J *et al* 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 145305
[16] Machtey O, Kessler D A and Khaykovich L 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 130403
[17] Machtey O, Shotan Z, Gross N and Khaykovich L 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 210406
[18] Knoop S, Borbely J S, Vassen W and Kokkelmans S J J M F 2012 Phys. Rev. A **86** 062705
[19] Zenesini A *et al* 2013 *New J. Phys.* **15** 043040
[20] Rem B S *et al* 2013 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** 163202
[21] Dyke P, Pollack S E and Hulet R G 2013 *Phys. Rev.* A **88** 023625
[22] Roy S *et al* 2013 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** 053202
[23] Nielsen E, Fedorov D V, Jensen A S and Garrido E 2001 *Phys. Rep.* **347** 373
[24] Braaten E and Hammer H-W 2006 *Phys. Rep.* **428** 259
[25] Huang B, Sidorenkov L A, Grimm R and Hutson J M 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** 190401
[26] Repp M *et al.* 2013 *Phys. Rev.* A **87** 010701(R)
[27] Tung S-K *et al.* 2013 *Phys. Rev.* A **87** 010702(R)
[28] Tung S-K, Jiménez-García K, Johansen J, Parker C and Chin C 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** 240402
[29] Pires R *et al.* 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** 250404
[30] Zinner N T 2014 *Few-Body Syst.* **55** 599
[31] Skorniakov G V and Ter-Martirosian K A 1956 *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **31** 775
[32] Danilov G 1961 *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **40** 498
[33] Pricoupenko L 2010 *Phys. Rev.* A **82** 043633
[34] Nygaard N G and Zinner N T 2014 *New J. Phys.* **16** 023026
[35] Yamashita M T *et al.* 2013 *Phys. Rev.* A **87** 062702
[36] Chin C, Grimm R, Julienne P S and Tiesinga E 2010 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82** 1225
[37] Ferlaino F, Zenesini A, Berninger M, Huang B, Nägerl H-C and Grimm R 2011 *Few-Body Syst.* **51** 113
[38] Lee M D, Köhler T and Julienne P S 2007 *Phys. Rev.* A **76** 012770
[39] Berninger M *et al* 2013 *Phys. Rev.* A **87** 032517
[40] Sørensen P K, Fedorov D V, Jensen A S and Zinner N T 2013 *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **46** 075301
[41] Schmidt R, Rath S P and Zwerger W 2012 *Eur. Phys. J.* B **85** 386
[42] Nygaard N, Schneider B I and Julienne P S 2006 *Phys. Rev.* A **73** 042705
[43] Naidon P, Hiyama E and Ueda M 2012 *Phys. Rev.* A **86** 012502
[44] Chin C 2011 *Preprint* arXiv:1111.1484
[45] Wang J, D'Incao J P, Esry B D and C. H. Greene C H 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 263001
[46] Sørensen P K, Fedorov D V, Jensen A S and Zinner N T 2012 *Phys. Rev.* A **86** 052516
[47] Naidon P, Endo S and Ueda M 2014 *Phys. Rev.* A **90** 022106
[48] Wang Y, Wang J, D'Incao J and Greene C H 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** 243201
[49] Naidon P, Endo S and Ueda M 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** 105301
[50] Nishida Y 2009 *Phys. Rev.* A **79** 013629
[51] MacNeill D and Zhou F 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** 145301
[52] Mathy C J M, Parish M M and Huse D A 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** 166404
[53] Niemann P and Hammer H-W 2012 *Phys. Rev.* A **86** 013628
[54] Endo S and Ueda M 2013 *Preprint* arXiv:1309.7797
[55] Esry B D, Greene C H and Burke J P 1999 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** 1751
[56] Sørensen P K, Fedorov D V, Jensen A S and Zinner N T 2013 *Phys. Rev.* A **88** 042518
[57] Zinner N T 2013 *Europhysics Lett.* **101** 60009; 2014 *Eur. Phys. J.* D **68** 261